THE SPIRIT AND PURPOSE OF AMERICAN DIPLOMACY

Wm F. Knox

ADDRESS BY

from his brother

HON. PHILANDER C. KNOX

June 18-1910.

AT THE

COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

AT

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

JUNE 15, 1910

THE SPIRIT AND PURPOSE OF AMERICAN DIPLOMACY

ADDRESS BY

HON. PHILANDER C. KNOX

AT THE

COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

AT

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

JUNE 15, 1910

Mr. Provost, and Ladies and Gentlemen:

The cosmopolitan character of this University, the increasing influence of the individual citizen upon the nature of international relations, owing to the more intimate and frequent personal intercourse between citizens of different countries, and the expanding sentimental and material interest in the subject, are considerations which have persuaded me that some observations upon the spirit which has animated American diplomacy and the purposes toward which our foreign policies have been directed may prove of interest on this occasion.

It is gratifying to believe that examination will disclose that our diplomacy has had a real and definite spirit and direction; that it has

not been based on expediency nor been driven hither and thither by the variable winds of opportunism, and that it has, in its justice, generosity, moderation, and candor, reflected the becoming attributes of a great people. That this is true will appear when we, though briefly, consider the spirit with which the United States has approached the adjustment of questions in which it has been directly interested and the purpose with which this Government has been inspired in its efforts to further the good of particular nations and to advance the general welfare of the world.

The willingness of the United States amicably to compose its own differences with other governments and its efforts to secure the general acceptance of the principle of international arbitration make a fine and consistent chapter in our diplomatic history.

Since American statecraft had its beginning in an effort to secure recognition for a young

nation struggling to relieve itself from what it considered to be intolerable oppressions, it is but natural that its earliest diplomatists should have been actuated and guided by broad principles of international right, justice, and equality, as well as by large and fundamental considerations of humanity. Representing a small and weak belligerent nation, beset with difficulties of discipline, organization, equipment, men, and finance, and realizing in the fullest measure, as they did, how near they were to losing, because of these deficiencies, their own struggle for what, in their opinion, was a just and righteous cause, it is not strange that these men should have later sought for some method of adjusting their international difficulties other than by the lawless uncertainties of war. Therefore, in negotiating the treaty of 1794 John Jay, finding it impossible at the moment definitely to adjust with Great Britain certain boundary disputes

along our frontier, as well as other differences affecting the citizens of the two countries, preferred to provide that such disputes should be settled by arbitration rather than to leave them as open questions capable, at any time, of irritating the two Governments into renewed conflict; and it must ever be said to the credit of the Government and the negotiators of the Mother Country that realizing, as they must have realized, the great advantage which they might with reason hope to obtain through an armed settlement of these questions, they still were not unwilling to join with the United States in negotiating a treaty which provided for the settlement of these disputes by peaceful means. By this treaty the two Governments ushered in "the modern era of arbitration." Well might Mr. Hamilton say to those who sought to discredit Jay and his work because of these provisions that "It would be a horrid and destructive principle

if nations could not determine a dispute about the title to a particular parcel of territory by amicable agreement, or by submission to arbitration as its substitute, but would be under an indispensable obligation to prosecute the dispute by arms, till real danger to the existence of one of the parties should justify, by the plea of extreme necessity, a surrender of its pretensions."

From this date, 1794, until the present time, the Government of the United States has uniformly and constantly exhausted every resource in order amicably and peaceably to adjust its international difficulties, and during this time it has, including those now pending, taken part in some seventy arbitrations, excluding various agreements to arbitrate not carried out because of settlement otherwise, as well as all conventional or diplomatic arrangements, delimitation commissions, and domestic commissions for the settlement of international

claims. The subjects submitted by this Government to the various arbitral tribunals have involved some of the most important and difficult questions which give rise to differences between states. They include boundary disputes, rights of fishing, the rights and duties of neutrals, interpretation of treaties, and the personal and property rights of American citizens resident in foreign countries.

It should, moreover, in connection with this matter, be observed that convinced as it has been that arbitration should be essentially a judicial rather than a diplomatic matter and that the award of an arbitral court should be not a compromise but a judgment founded upon principles of law and equity, this Government has time and again upon due and appropriate occasion submitted to international tribunals questions of international law which had been already passed upon and determined by the Supreme Court of the United States,

this Government having, of course, always accepted the awards of these tribunals even where, as in some cases, their decisions have not been in accord with those which had been previously pronounced by its own highest court.

Indeed, the United States has taken even more advanced ground and has said that, inasmuch as arbitration is thus, as stated, a judicial rather than a diplomatic procedure, the judgment of an arbitration court must conform to the principles of law and equity involved and controlling, and that where, in its opinion, it is wholly clear and evident that a decision essentially fails so to conform, such decision should be open to an international judicial revision. It is in accordance with this principle that the United States and Venezuela have recently negotiated a protocol of arbitration providing for the submission to The Hague of the question of the revision of an international award.

It was pursuant to this same principle that, in the case of Pelletier against Haiti, the Government of the United States, upon the protest of the Government of Haiti, and as the result of an investigation of the facts and circumstances surrounding the case, itself declined to enforce and set aside the award made by the arbitrator, in favor of the American claimant, on the ground that the arbitrator had misconceived and, therefore, disregarded the scope of the terms of submission.

It was this same spirit and understanding of international arbitration that led the Government of the United States, upon charges of grave irregularity, to join with Venezuela in a revision of the awards made by the United States and Venezuela Commission of 1866, and which also prompted the action of the United States in the La Abra and Weil cases, in which this Government, having be-

come convinced that fraud had been practiced by the American claimants in an arbitration with the Government of Mexico, relieved Mexico from paying such part of the award as it had not already paid, returned to Mexico the sums paid upon the award and undistributed to the claimants, and in addition, appropriated by Congressional act a sum to repay Mexico the amount which had been paid and distributed to the claimants and which was, therefore, beyond the reach of the United States.

Not only did American and British diplomacy, by the treaty of 1794, usher in "the modern era of arbitration" as to specific subjects covered by special arbitration agreements, but in 1897, the Foreign Offices of the two Governments having reached the conclusion that certainly as between England and the United States there were no questions of any kind whatsoever which might not be and

which ought not to be settled by international arbitration, there was signed at Washington a convention which provided:

> "The High Contracting Parties agree to submit to arbitration in accordance with the provisions and subject to the limitations of this Treaty *all questions in difference* between them which they may fail to adjust by diplomatic negotiation."

While this convention failed of ratification in the Senate for reasons which need not be discussed, it clearly pointed the way in which the diplomacy of the two governments was moving, and indeed marked the point to which the two foreign offices had advanced. As a partial fruition of the diplomatic hope thus expressed in this unratified treaty there has very recently, May 13, 1910, been signed, ratified, and proclaimed a convention between the United States and Great Britain, which provides for the organization of an

international joint commission for primary jurisdiction over questions relating to boundary waters, and also stipulates that:

> "*Any questions or matters of difference arising between the High Contracting Parties involving the rights, obligations, or interests of the United States or of the Dominion of Canada, either in relation to each other or to their respective inhabitants, may be referred for decision to the International Joint Commission.*"

Although the findings of this commission as to matters thus referred to it are not, under the terms of the convention, to be absolutely binding and conclusive upon the two Governments, yet such findings, particularly if fortified by the opinion of the umpire, for the appointment of whom a subsequent section of the article provides, will be most persuasive upon the respective parties to the treaty, and it is confidently predicted that rarely or never

will it happen that the decisions of this commission will not be regarded as a final disposition of the matters involved. It is indeed a hopeful augury for universal peace that the conscience of two such powerful nations as the United States and Great Britain, whose great general interests are in so many cases keenly competitive and whose territories are for great distances contiguous and separated merely by an imaginary line, has been so quickened for justice and righteousness as to provide that only right, law, and equity shall determine all matters which, as to the territories concerned, may hereafter be the subject of dispute between them.

Not only has the United States sought thus to settle its own difficulties by the implements of peace rather than by those of war, but it has assiduously exerted all proper pressure to induce the world to adopt the principle of arbitration as a means of settlement

of international disputes. Passing with a mere allusion the various American peace societies and able and distinguished American scholars, philanthropists, and statesmen who have worked with ardor, ability, and success, not only in the United States, but in all parts of the civilized world, for the establishment of peace and the pacific settlement of international disputes, I beg to direct your attention to the fact that in his instructions to the American representatives of the first official world's peace conference of 1899, Secretary Hay, after commenting upon the various features of the suggested program, declared:

> "The eighth article, which proposes the wider extension of good offices, mediation and arbitration, seems likely to open the most fruitful field for discussion and future action * * * *. The duty of sovereign states to promote international justice by all wise and effective means is only secondary to the

fundamental necessity of preserving their own existence. Next in importance to their independence is the great fact of their interdependence.

Nothing can secure for human government and for the authority of law which it represents so deep a respect and so firm a loyalty as the spectacle of sovereign and independent states, whose duty it is to prescribe the rules of justice and impose penalties upon the lawless, bowing with reverence before the august supremacy of those principles of right which give to law its eternal foundation."

The Secretary accompanied his instructions by a short but broad and comprehensive plan for an international court of arbitration which should "be of a permanent character and shall be always open" for the consideration of cases which might be reported to it. The conference was not, however, at the time, of a temper to recommend so complete a judicial plan as that proposed by Mr. Hay

and presented by the American delegation, and there was accordingly (largely as the result of the indefatigable labors of the delegation of this Government), drawn up and approved by the conference, and later ratified by various powers, a convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, which, however, lacked "the fundamental idea of the American plan [which] was a court which should not only be permanent but continuous in its functions." The convention adopted was, however, a long stride in the direction of the peaceful settlement of international disputes, and not a few of its provisions, particularly regarding mediation between powers about to engage or already engaged in war, were textually proposed by members of the American delegation.

Under and pursuant to the provisions of this convention this Government has already negotiated and concluded some nineteen gen-

eral treaties which, with several others in process of negotiation, provide that national differences which may arise of a legal nature or relating to the interpretation of treaties existing between the two contracting parties and which it may not have been possible to settle by diplomacy, shall be submitted to arbitration for determination and settlement provided such questions do not affect the vital interests, the independence, or the honor of the two contracting states and do not concern the interests of third parties. It is firmly believed that these conventions postpone to the remotest possibility the likelihood of failure amicably to adjust with the other contracting parties all questions national in their character which affect the international relations and intercourse of the contracting states as such.

It is of more than passing interest to note that in referring the Pious Fund Case to this

international tribunal for determination the United States and Mexico were the first of the signatory powers to invoke the jurisdiction of this newly constituted tribunal; and it is unnecessary to add that the award in this case has been scrupulously observed by Mexico, against whom it was made.

The efforts of the American delegation at the Second Hague Conference resulted in the readoption in an extended and amended form of the Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, as well as the framing and adoption of a convention for an International Court of Prize. But the Conference also went considerably further and recommended to the nations of the world the establishment of a court of arbitration in accordance with the fundamental idea of the plan submitted to the first Conference at the instance of Secretary Hay—that the court should be "always open,"—"a court which should not

only be permanent but continuous in its functions."

The general plan of this tribunal, which was elaborated by the American, British, and German delegates, with the hearty cooperation and support of the French, incorporated, in addition to the fundamental idea of permanence adopted from the Hay plan, the fundamental principles and procedure embodied in the conventions for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes and for the establishment of the International Court of Prize. Inasmuch as it thus contained only such provisions as had in essence already been adopted by the powers in the two conventions above named, the Government of the United States, conceiving that there could be no objection to adopting the machinery of the International Prize Court for the Permanent Court of Arbitration, issued on October 18, 1909, an identic circular note proposing to the powers

alternative procedure for the International Prize Court and the investment of the International Prize Court with the functions of a Court of Arbitral Justice. This proposition has been most favorably received by the powers, and it is confidently expected that the initiative of the United States will lead to the early establishment at The Hague of a Permanent Court of Arbitration. Such an eventuality will be the realization of one of the aspirations of all the centuries. The ideal is as old as the Roman altar of peace or the temple of Claudius and Vespasian. Its realization can not, however, be regarded as the conception or the work of any one man or nation, but the fruition and crystallization of the thought and ideals of the governments and statesmen who for ages have worked for peace, and a monument of an advanced Christian civilization, in the rearing of which the United States will have been happy indeed to have a part.

The glory of such an achievement, like a mantle descending from on high, will be ample enough to enfold all who have contributed to its accomplishment.

The same just, friendly, and generous American spirit is conspicuously shown in our diplomatic and other efforts in the interest of particular nations at critical times or in respect to matters of great consequence affecting the welfare of other nations.

For example, from the very commencement of our intercourse with China, American diplomacy in that Empire has been marked by a just regard for the rights of China as a sovereign power and has consistently aimed to promote the interests of the Chinese people no less than those of our own. Not infrequently, indeed, it has been occupied in disinterested mediation in behalf of China, and has given its assistance to the program of reform by which the Peking Government is

seeking to improve political and social conditions in the Empire.

In spite of many mutual misunderstandings and the insistent desire of Americans in China that their Government should cooperate in the warlike measures of other governments, we have adhered steadfastly to the belief that a policy of patience and peace was the only correct one; that the difficulties in the way of cordial intercourse were chiefly due to differences of manners and customs; and that only time was needed to establish mutual confidence.

The first treaty entered into by the United States with China was negotiated by Caleb Cushing, and signed at Wanghia in 1844. In it the spirit and purpose of American diplomacy are admirably illustrated by the article which provides that American citizens who shall trade in opium shall be subject to be dealt with by the Chinese Government

without being entitled to any countenance or protection from that of the United States. Thus, the very commencement of our diplomatic intercourse with China was signalized by uncompromising hostility to the opium traffic, to which the Chinese Government has always been steadfastly opposed.

Notwithstanding that China was compelled by treaties with certain powers in 1858 to legalize the traffic, the United States again in 1880 agreed that Americans should not be permitted in any way to engage in this trade, and that they should not be allowed to plead the favored-nation clause of the treaty in their defense.

Still more effective, however, was the action of this Government in 1906, in proposing to the powers having territorial possessions in the far East the appointment of a commission to study the opium problem and propose measures for its solution. This com-

mission has agreed unanimously upon certain resolutions which, at the further suggestion of our Government, are shortly to be laid before an international conference to be held at The Hague.

The first appointment of diplomatic officers to represent China at the capitals of the world was due to a suggestion made by the American minister at Peking, Anson Burlinghame, who, with the consent of our Government, resigned his post in 1867 that he might accept the invitation of China to head a mission to eleven of the great powers, intended to bring about a better understanding and establish closer relations with them. Mr. Burlinghame encountered considerable hostile criticism because he insisted that China should have more freedom to manage her affairs without interference by others. In this, however, he but voiced the sentiments of the American Government, and his mission,

though unfortunately interrupted by his death, was undoubtedly instrumental in securing for China a better position *vis-à-vis* the western powers.

In one of our treaties with China (1858) we undertake, if any other nation should act unjustly or oppressively toward China, to exert our good offices, on being informed of the case, to bring about an amicable arrangement of the question, thus showing friendly feeling.

Pursuant to this agreement, when the Chinese forces had been defeated by the victorious advance of the Japanese in Manchuria in 1895, the American Government exerted its good offices to bring about a cessation of hostilities and the negotiation of a treaty of peace. A former Secretary of State was adviser to the Chinese Government in concluding this treaty. During this same war, too, the consular and diplomatic authorities of

the United States took charge of Chinese subjects and their interests in Japan, and of Japanese subjects and their interests in China.

Similarly, when hostilities broke out between Russia and Japan in the Manchurian provinces of China, the American Government exerted its influence to restrict the military operations to those provinces, encouraged China in the preservation of a strict neutrality, and finally brought about the negotiations at Portsmouth, New Hampshire, which resulted in a treaty of peace, in which the sovereignty of China in the region concerned was unequivocally recognized.

In referring to our diplomatic relations with China, it is impossible to omit mentioning the policy with which the name of the late John Hay will ever be honorably associated, commonly known as the policy of the "Open Door." Following the lease in 1898 and 1899 of various portions of Chinese

territory to Germany, Russia, France, and Great Britain, with exchanges of notes in which these Powers, together with Japan, were recognized each as having special interests within certain provinces of the Chinese Empire, the United States secured from each of these Powers a declaration giving assurance of equality of treatment within these so-called "spheres of interest" for nationals of all the Powers; and, preliminary to the settlement of the Boxer troubles, the United States again addressed the interested Powers, securing their assent to the principle of the preservation of Chinese territorial and administrative entity and equality of commercial opportunity. It was especially to safeguard these principles that the United States Government interested itself so actively in the question of municipal government at Harbin in Manchuria, in that of the working of mines along the Mukden-Antung Railway, in the

proposed construction of the Chinchow-Aigun Railway, and made the proposal to neutralize the railways of Manchuria and sought for American capital a participation in the loan for the Hukuang Railways.

There are various important provisions in our commercial treaty of 1903 which evidence our interest in the promotion of reforms which must result in benefit to the Chinese people. Among these are the engagements entered into by China to establish a uniform currency, to adopt reasonable mining regulations, to revise the penal code, and to establish a system of modern courts. The United States, on its part, has promised to lend its assistance to these reforms, and has given assurance that when the courts and laws of China warrant it, the United States will consent to the abolition of extraterritoriality.

The provision respecting a uniform currency has not yet been fulfilled, but immedi-

ately after the ratification of the treaty the American Government sent a special commissioner to China to give expert assistance in devising a practicable scheme for the establishment of such a currency.

Many other instances might be given in illustration of the altruistic spirit in American diplomatic relations with China, none of which, however, has excited more favorable comment than the return in 1885 of a balance of $453,400 left in the Treasury of the United States after payment of claims growing out of the Chinese resistance to British military operations around Canton in the fifties, and more recently the Act of Congress authorizing the return to China of the balance of the Boxer indemnity, which will amount to some $11,000,000.

As in China, so in Japan, the helpful and friendly spirit of American diplomacy has been constantly manifest.

The history of modern Japan began with the landing of Commodore Perry in 1853, when, overcoming the obstacles that had baffled every previous effort, he succeeded in opening that country to foreign intercourse. His achievement was justly hailed, both in Europe and America, as a great triumph of peaceful diplomacy.

Nowhere is this fact better understood or more readily acknowledged than in Japan itself. Nine years ago a stone tablet was unveiled at Kurihama, Japan, in commemoration of the landing of Perry on that spot forty-eight years before. The tablet was erected by funds subscribed by the Japanese Court and people, and the inscription was written by Japan's leading statesman—one of the foremost statesmen of the world—the late Prince Ito. In the course of the ceremony, the presiding officer said: "This monument is erected to preserve on stone our determination never

to forget the friendship of the United States that sent Commodore Perry to us in a peaceful way to open up intercourse with foreign powers." It has been truly said that "such an occasion and such a tribute are without a parallel in the history of nations."

Commodore Perry was followed by Townsend Harris, whose patient and unselfish efforts in laying the foundations of diplomatic intercourse with Japan are too little appreciated, even by his own countrymen; for while "the genius of Perry unbarred the gate of the Island Empire and left it ajar, it was the skill of Harris that threw it open to the commercial enterprise of the world." A man of distinguished ability and striking moral character, he is held in grateful remembrance by the Japanese people of to-day.

The modern progress of Japan, which began with the arrival of Commodore Perry, has been influenced and assisted at every stage

by the disinterested friendship of the United States. Japan's earliest attempts at a reorganized government were based upon the American model, and American ideals shaped her educational and financial institutions. American advisers assisted in the development of agriculture, a postal system, and foreign intercourse. America, alone of the foreign powers, returned the indemnity exacted after the attack upon foreign vessels at Shimonoseki in 1863. It was America that took the lead in recognizing Japan's inherent right to complete autonomy in matters of tariff and jurisdiction, and as early as 1878 advocated a revision of the ancient treaties to accomplish that result. In 1886, an extradition treaty was negotiated between the two countries, on a reciprocal basis, largely, as stated by President Cleveland at the time, "because of the support which its conclusion would give to Japan in her efforts towards

judicial autonomy and complete sovereignty." The treaties that are in effect to-day, signed in 1894, were framed on the lines that had for years previously been advocated by the United States.

In a similar manner, Korea was opened to the world by the treaty of Commodore Shufeldt in 1882, an act which has always been regarded by the Koreans as a recognition of the disinterested friendship of the United States, and by the world at large as another peaceful success of American diplomacy in the far East. The development of the country has been largely promoted by American physicians, teachers, missionaries, and expert advisers.

Our relations with Siam have been marked by the same spirit of impartial friendliness throughout the whole course of its modern history.

The people of this country may well be proud of the fact that during more than half a century of disturbed conditions in the Orient, the United States made its influence felt and attained conspicuous success in the development of the commerce of the world without the firing of a hostile gun, save in one or two isolated instances where an unprovoked attack had first been made upon the American flag.

Turning to the near East, this Government has viewed with deep sympathy the efforts of the Young Turks to establish and maintain in their country a more liberal government which would insure to the people the enjoyment of the blessings of liberty, equality, and justice; and, true to our own traditions, we have seen with much satisfaction the reestablishment of a constitutional form of government in the Ottoman Empire. The succeeding course of events, the vigorous efforts of this party to rehabilitate their

country and gradually to restore it to a high place among the modern nations of the world, are being watched with the keenest interest and most cordial sympathy.

The American policy in the near East has, as elsewhere, been entirely open and free from sinister endeavors. The work of our diplomatic and consular representatives has been devoted to the protection of American citizens and their property, and the peaceful extension of American commerce.

The educational and medical institutions in Turkey which have been established by the American missions and which have been productive of so much good have received at all times all proper support from this Government.

The world-famed Robert College, at Constantinople, has done much to spread western enlightenment and progress throughout that region. Many statesmen of note

have there received the principles of western civilization.

American institutions in Turkey have done a great work—a work which has also favorably affected the peaceful extension of American commerce. There have been no selfish motives behind these endeavors; and it is pleasant to relate as a mere indication of the popular attitude toward the United States that when the reestablishment of the constitution was proclaimed, the great concourse of people in the streets of Constantinople with one accord enthusiastically cheered the American flag.

For some years past the conditions in the Kongo have engaged the earnest attention of a large class of our philanthropic citizens. As far back as 1906 the President expressed his earnest desire to see the full performance of the treaty obligations which were designed for the uplifting of the natives of the African

domain and for the opening of its commerce to the world, and publicly emphasized his purpose to lend the influence of this Government, so far as might be proper, toward a realization of any needed humanitarian reforms. Ways for releasing the natives from the burdensome conditions oppressing them and starting them upon the path of self-support and moral development have been the subject of careful investigation, not only by the American and British representatives in the Kongo, but by special Belgian agents, and have been maturely debated by the Belgian legislative body. The announced annexation of the Independent State of the Kongo was followed by numerous proposed reform measures. The attitude of the United States has been one of benevolent encouragement, in the hope that the promised reforms would in their actual operation meet the high demands of public sentiment. With the accession of King Al-

bert, who, as well as his Minister of the Colonies, has recently personally visited the Kongo and studied conditions there, encouragement is felt for an effective policy of practical reform. I am happy to say that the recent promulgation of decrees to facilitate free trade, revise the rubber tax, and ameliorate other burdensome conditions are a further augury of the accomplishment of an end which we, together with the rest of the civilized world, ardently desire to see attained in that vast region peopled by our less fortunate fellow-men.

An excellent example of the disinterestedness and fairness which characterize American diplomacy is afforded in the traditional attitude which the United States has assumed toward Liberia. This little negro republic on the west coast of equatorial Africa was founded in 1822, under the auspices of the American Colonization Society, with the aid

and assistance of the United States Government. The motives underlying the movement which resulted in the founding of Liberia were: The hope of the abolition of slavery and colonization of the free negroes, the providing of a refuge for negroes captured on slave traders, and of a home for American negroes, and the desire to civilize and Christianize Africa through the instrumentality of such colonization.

Beginning with the recognition of Liberian independence by the United States in 1862, the United States has almost uninterruptedly, in one way or another, shown its interest in the maintenance and welfare of the negro republic. The first diplomatic negotiations between this country and Liberia resulted in a formal expression of this Government's interest in the welfare of the former American colonists. In 1866 Congress authorized the transfer of a gunboat to Liberia, and three

years later the War Department turned over to that Government at small cost a large quantity of arms and military stores. Since that time hardly a year has passed in which the United States has not used its good offices in behalf of Liberia, principally in boundary disputes with Great Britain and France.

Perhaps the most significant indication of the continued interest of the United States in Liberia was the sending of a Commission to that country last year under authority of Congress, to inquire into conditions there and report recommendations to the Department of State.

The Commission's report and recommendations were submitted to Congress on March 25 last, and the Department of State is now engaged in working out the details of a plan in harmony with the Commission's recommendations, which will give Liberia a new start on the path to national stability and

individual progress, so that she may be in a position to accomplish the purpose of her original American founders.

I now turn to what is by far the most active sphere of American diplomacy, namely, that of our relations with the twenty other republics of the Western Hemisphere. Most of these republics are passing through an evolution similar to our own—that of the peopling and developing of vast areas and the attempt to perfect republican government under similar institutions. Now that so many of the republics to the south of us have achieved government as stable, as enlightened, and as responsible as our own, it becomes more and more incumbent upon the citizens of this country to know and appreciate our neighbors to the south, and it should, I think, be interesting to trace some of the influences of the diplomacy of the United States in the

wonderful development and in the welding of the Pan-American family of nations.

From the time the United States became an independent nation this Government, while respecting its obligations to European powers, has frankly and consistently wrought for the establishment and maintenance of a popular, free, and independent form of government for the countries which share with us this Hemisphere. Just emerged from our own war of independence, the struggle of the southern republics awoke a responsive chord in the heart of the American people, and in 1823 this Government hastened to recognize as sovereign states the republics of Spanish South America, and named ministers to represent it at their capitals. So in the case of Brazil, the heritage of Portugal's vast domain in America, the United States was first to recognize its independence. A few years before, President Monroe had promulgated

the doctrine which bears his name, and the Holy Alliance had failed in its efforts to restore South America to the crowns of Spain and Portugal. Some years later Europe sought to impose by military power an emperor upon Mexico. During all these difficult early days our Government's intense interest and active support were invariably found on the side of liberty and republicanism for all the free and equal republics of the Americas.

Turning to modern examples, by the Spanish-American Treaty signed at Paris in 1898 and its accompanying documents this Government, to the surprise of the world, spontaneously, and by action for which history scarcely affords a precedent, recognized the independence of Cuba.

The invariable fervid and inherent sentiment for self-government has had a large part in this Government's sympathy with the

recent eviction by their own long-suffering fellow-countrymen of such tyrants as Castro, whose regime has given way to better things, and Zelaya, whose cruel misgovernment it is hoped will soon be succeeded by a Government really responsible and republican.

By such advances the less fortunate republics tend gradually to a stature of equality as real as the equality of their sovereignty, and to the high level of stability, justice, moderation, and mutual responsibility which characterizes their more fortunate sisters.

One of the aims of the diplomacy of the United States has been to contribute as much as possible in helpfulness to these ends. True stability is best established not by military but by economic and social forces. A certain area of Central America has been notoriously racked by revolution, and, by a sad history of turbulence and instability, had been

robbed of that flourishing prosperity which should be its natural heritage.

While the greater American republics have long since acquired an industrial and governmental credit comparable to that of the oldest nations, the treasuries of some of the most backward republics have at times virtually succumbed under the weight of exorbitant foreign loans, which, with improvident financial administration, have sunk them deep in debt. The problem of good government is inextricably interwoven with that of economic prosperity and sound finance; financial stability contributes perhaps more than any other one factor to political stability.

The Republic of Honduras is typical as a country laboring under the disadvantages referred to. It has a heavy bonded debt, held in Europe, for which it has in its national wealth no proportional return. The interest fell in arears and it became absolutely neces-

sary that the debt be refunded and the finances placed upon a sound basis. At this juncture a group of American bankers came forward prepared to offer terms more advantageous to Honduras than those offered on behalf of the actual creditors. Believing that a strong Honduras would tend enormously toward a stable and prosperous Central America, this Government is heartily supporting the plan for its financial rehabilitation. If the arrangement made proves, upon the closest scrutiny, to be just and equitable, then this Government will be prepared, with the consent of the Senate if a treaty is desirable, to give it such sanction as shall afford the bankers legitimate security for their investment by recognition of such relation as the Government of Honduras may create between the payments due the lender and a proper portion of the customs revenues.

As illustrating the manner in which it is hoped that American diplomacy may thus benefit Honduras and Central America, it is a pleasure to refer to the signal success of the Santo Domingo arrangement. The political history of Santo Domingo from the foundation of the Republic in 1844 until 1905, the year of the *modus vivendi*, which was followed by the Convention of February 8, 1907, may be likened to a kaleidoscope of revolution interrupted only by despotism. Through these chaotic years foreign bondholders of three or four different nationalities had by various arrangements mortgages upon the revenues of as many different ports as security for loans, sometimes usurious and always squandered. The situation had become from every point of view impossible, and Santo Domingo turned to the United States for assistance. After the consideration of various plans the before-mentioned *modus*

vivendi and Convention were hit upon as a satisfactory solution. As a result of the good offices of this Government the great majority of the creditors, relying upon the guarantee to be afforded by the financial stability brought about through the Convention, accepted a settlement whereby outstanding obligations to the face value of some thirty or forty million dollars were funded for about seventeen million dollars. Thus the assistance of the United States has enabled the Republic of Santo Domingo to reduce by half the face value of its debt, to furnish unquestioned security, and to have a customs administration so efficient that, after caring for the liquidation of a relatively enormous debt, it has supplied ample funds for all governmental purposes, the surplus for such purposes being actually greater in amount than the total revenues which entercd the Dominican treasury prior to the present customs admin-

istration. On its political side it has freed Santo Domingo from apprehension of intervention on the part of creditor nations, and has contributed immensely to domestic tranquillity and prosperity, unaccompanied by violent repression, to a degree never before known in the Republic.

The Santo Domingo plan was vigorously opposed in and out of Congress by those who regarded it as a deviation from our policy of aloofness from participation in the internal affairs of other countries. I suppose it was a departure, but if this Government can help to upbuild its neighbors and promote the thought that the capital of the more advanced nations of the world would be better employed in assisting the peaceful development of those more backward than in financing wars, it is such a deviation from traditions as the American people will approve.

The spirit of good neighborhood and of mutual helpfulness, consideration, and confidence has always made possible to our diplomacy the settlement with a minimum of friction of the great variety of questions which geographical proximity has from time to time raised between us and our Canadian kinsmen. In the same spirit we are soon to negotiate with them for a tariff arrangement of greater mutuality and more consistent with our common interests of neighborhood. With the republics to the south of us, commerce, which makes so powerfully for friendship, is flourishing under conditions very favorable to their great export products, and which it is hoped may in time be adjusted in some cases upon a more reciprocal basis. The investment of our surplus capital and the exportation of our products not absorbed by the home market, like the foreign enterprises of our citizens, which increase with the slackening of the

domestic demand for their activities, should vitalize our commerce with the other American republics.

The completion of the Panama Canal will be seen within a few years as the culmination of four centuries of aspiration. That the Government of the United States, when private enterprise had failed, itself undertook the burden and responsibility of this great work is a good indication of the importance this Government attaches to the advancement of Pan-American relations. The United States has always taken a sympathetic and practical interest in the advancement of the Pan-American railroad. It would be most desirable to see as much as possible of the great highway, which it is necessary to build to connect the Americas, built by the cooperation of the enterprise of the countries through which it passes and, by convention, dedicated solely to the uses of commerce upon

reasonable and equal terms. The cause of American peace would be greatly advanced if its use were forbidden for military purposes in the event of internal war in any country or in the event of war between countries through which it passes.

Through the historic demonstration of the candor and singleness of purpose of this Government's diplomacy, and through its quiet application to the task of doing and of seeking equity and justice, these relations, I believe, stand to-day upon a foundation firmer as they become more intimate; and the fact that the spirit of neighborly helpfulness is common to governments of other American republics and to our own is shown increasingly year by year.

To mention only one or two of many examples to illustrate this fact, one may recall the settlement of the acute boundary trouble between Peru and Ecuador, the reference of Bolivia

the ancient Panama-Costa Rican boundary dispute to arbitration through the good offices of the United States, and, quite recently, the tripartite offer of mediation by which the Argentine Republic, the United States of Brazil, and the United States of America, acting in the most harmonious accord, cast the influence of three great American republics on the side of peace in an effort to avert pending war between Peru and Ecuador, an action by which the three governments have given to this hemisphere the honor of first invoking the most far-reaching provisions of the Hague Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes.

I have sought to show by this review how uniformly and consistently the motives and results of our international action have tended

to advance the brotherhood of nations. We have indeed, as is right, firmly maintained our national sovereignty and dignity and the rights of our citizens, and we have not avoided war when honor and duty have invoked that stern arbitrament. Nevertheless we have loyally submitted ourselves to the control of the ideals of peace and to the principles of international comity and good will; and we have exerted our influence and good offices to guide and aid others along that path. We have not, indeed, stood alone in this attitude, but have acted in concert with other powers who recognize the same high call and seek the same great ends. From the ages when barbarism and cruelty dominated the world, through the intervening eras when advancing civilization slowly extended to relations between states the forces of enlightened and beneficent private conduct, we have reached a point when it is evident that the future holds in store a time

when wars shall cease; when the nations of the world shall realize a federation as real and vital as that now subsisting between the component parts of a single state; when by deliberate international conjunction the strong shall universally help the weak, and when the corporate righteousness of the world shall compel unrighteousness to disappear and shall destroy the habitations of cruelty still lingering in the dark places of the earth. This is "the spirit of the wide world brooding on things to come." That day will be the Millenium, of course; but in some sense and degree it will surely be realized in this dispensation of mortal time.

It is for this country always to maintain its historic policy and attitude, to be true to this greatest duty of a nation, which is entirely consistent with all its internal duties, to advance that time which the whole course of

history and all divine prophecies and revelations alike presage.

"The tumult and the shouting dies, the captains and the kings depart;" let us invoke that solemn prayer of the poet "lest we forget" that the ancient sacrifice still remains—the sacrifice of the submission to the Almighty of the hearts of a people resolute for righteousness. Thus we shall realize in some sort ourselves and shall help the world and the future to realize that "far-off divine event to which the whole creation moves."